

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant City of Arroyo Grande

Project TitlePreparation of a Salt and NutrientCountySan Luis ObispoManagement Plan for the Northern CitiesGrant Request\$ 250,000.00

Management Plan for the Northern Cities Grant Request \$ 250,000.00

Management Area and the Nipomo Mesa Total Project Cost \$ 250,000.00

Management Area

<u>Project Description:</u> The proposed project develops a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan and a conceptual model to support groundwater management, modeling, and reporting requirements for a portion of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	3
Schedule	3
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	35

- ➤ **GWMP or Program:** The applicant's groundwater basin (Santa Maria groundwater basin) is an ordered adjudicated basin with an equivalent GWMP. Supporting documentation from the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Maria is provided.
- Echnical Adequacy of Work to be Performed: Criterion for the project description is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant met every scoring criterion and provided substantial supporting documentation. The application includes a thorough description of the project, goals, and objectives; collaboration with other local agencies; demonstrates the need for and merit of the project; demonstrates that an achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement of groundwater management which is consistent with the goals of the groundwater management program will be attained; and explains how ongoing use of the product of the project will be funded after the grant is expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion for the work plan is fully addressed. The deliverables are clearly identified and an adequate level of detail was provided. The work plan is tasked out and consistent with the budget and schedule; supports the adjudicated basin equivalent GWMP and IRWM Plan; provides examples of how the information obtained will be disseminated to the public, stakeholders, and regulatory agencies; and discusses CEQA compliance.
- **Budget:** The criterion for the budget is not fully addressed and incomplete documentation was provided. The budget coincides with the work plan and schedule; however, there is neither detail explaining how the costs for the tasks were derived, nor what assumptions were made, such a subcontractor quotes, nor information on hourly rates and number of hours for each task to allow judgment on whether the budget task costs are reasonable. Table 1 lists related summary budget information on completed and ongoing projects related to the proposed project, but is otherwise not directly relevant to the budget for the proposal.
- Schedule: The criterion for the schedule is not fully addressed. There is no explanation of how the schedule was derived and why the project is beginning 6 six (6) months after the estimated award.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- QA/QC: The criterion for the QA/QC is addressed, but not fully documented. The QA/QC measures lack detail and QA/QC procedures are not well defined. For example, the Applicant states that consultants will perform QA/QC of basin characterization, cross check data sources, perform sensitivity analysis, and utilize a mass balance approach, but does not specify the standardized methodologies or analyses that will be used, or the project-specific QA/QC thresholds. With respect to the qualifications of personnel that will be retained, the applicant indicates that a qualified consultant will have experience in carrying out SNMPs and will be knowledgeable about hydrologic and hydrogeologic characteristics of the basin. No information is provided on comparison and calibration models on which to base the proposed Salt and Nutrient Model.
- ➤ <u>Past Performance:</u> The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The grantee included several examples of previous work that was completed within the scheduled timeframe and within the allotted budget, including a previous LGA grant for a Desalinization Study.